United Nations A/C.2/67/SR.38

General Assembly
Sixty-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
30 January 2013

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 38th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 14 December 2012, at 4.30 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Talbot ..... (Guyana)

Contents

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) International migration and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 25: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

Agenda item 116: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Working methods of the Second Committee

Agenda item 131: Programme planning (*continued*)

Completion of the Committee's work at the main part of its sixty-seventh session

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

12-64958 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 5.30 p.m.

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.24, L.25 and L.62)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/67/L.24 and L.62: International financial system and development (*continued*)

1. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.62, submitted by Mr. Stefanile (Italy), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.24. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Stefanile** (Italy) made a minor editorial correction to the draft resolution.

3. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.62, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

4. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.24 was withdrawn.*

Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.25: Follow-up to the Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development (*continued*)

5. **The Chair** said that it was his understanding that a number of provisions of the draft resolution had been incorporated into draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.62, and that the sponsors therefore wished to withdraw it.

6. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.25 was withdrawn.*

The meeting was suspended at 5.35 p.m. and resumed at 7 p.m.

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) International migration and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.15/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.15/Rev.1: International migration and development (*continued*)

7. **The Chair** informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested by Cyprus on behalf of the States members of the European Union.

8. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications, said that the two-day high-level dialogue on migration and development provided for in paragraphs 2, 3 (b) (i) and 3 (b) (ii) would comprise four plenary meetings and four parallel round-table meetings with interpretation in all official languages and verbatim records for the plenary meetings. Interpretation services and verbatim records for the plenary meetings would be provided using the meeting entitlements of the General Assembly. However, the interpretation services for the four parallel round-table meetings would add to the meetings workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, entailing additional requirements in the amount of $44,800 for 2013.

9. Interpretation services for the one-day informal hearings in 2013 provided for in paragraph 11 would use the meeting entitlements of the General Assembly and would therefore not entail any additional resource requirements.

10. Should the draft resolution be adopted, additional requirements of $44,800 would therefore arise under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. However, all possible efforts would be made to absorb those additional requirements within the existing resources under section 2 and to report thereon in the context of the second performance report for the biennium 2012-2013.

11. **Mr. Landveld** (Suriname), speaking as the facilitator of the informal consultations, said that the phrase "after consultation" in paragraph 13 should be replaced with "in consultation". It was unfortunate that the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus on the draft resolution; humanity had managed to populate all the continents of the world because people were by nature migrants.

12. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that while her delegation supported the concept behind the draft resolution and the decision to hold a high-level dialogue on international migration and development, it was important that the dialogue should be open to all stakeholders. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations, academic institutions and the private sector played a crucial role by advocating for the human rights of migrants, regardless of their immigration status, and by

implementing migrant assistance programmes. Their expertise was therefore essential to the success of the high-level dialogue.

13. International, regional and national NGOs had written to Member States to express their concerns about provisions in the draft resolution that would limit their participation without transparency or due process. Her delegation shared those concerns, as the draft resolution would allow Member States to exclude civil society representatives on a non-objection basis. There were precedents for addressing any concerns about given NGOs. Had the negotiators drawn on those precedents, consensus could have been reached. The modalities for the participation of civil society in the United Nations system were crucial to the Organization's openness, dynamism and relevance. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

14. **Ms. Zoupaniotis** (Cyprus), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union, said that while the European Union remained committed to ensuring a successful high-level dialogue, its members were disappointed by the decision to omit the request that the President of the General Assembly should prepare a summary of the proceedings. Other delegations had called for a negotiated outcome document. However, the issues were not sufficiently mature, and attempting to agree on such a document would negatively affect the high-level dialogue.

15. The reluctance of some delegations to ensure the full participation of civil society in the high-level dialogue was also disappointing. A strong and open dialogue with genuine and relevant civil society groups, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, would be an important component of the event. Throughout the consultations, the States members of the European Union had consistently maintained that the accreditation of NGOs should be completely transparent and that the General Assembly should be fully involved. Paragraph 12 of the draft resolution seemed to imply that Member States would be able to examine and challenge possible objections made by other States to the presence of civil society representatives or specific NGOs in an open and transparent manner. It was hoped that Member States would adopt a more constructive approach in future discussions on civil society participation at the United Nations.

16. **Mr. Wang** Qun (China), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Article 71 of the Charter of the United Nations and resolution 1996/31 of the Economic and Social Council provided that the participation of NGOs in the activities of the United Nations should be decided upon in consultation with Member States. His delegation had therefore always maintained that the participation of NGOs at high-level meetings of the General Assembly should, in accordance with recent practice, be based on the non-objection approach. Some countries, displaying a total disregard for the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the established practice of the General Assembly, had tried to hinder the participation of NGOs in an attempt to prevent the formulation of an outcome document. In order to uphold the Charter of the United Nations, his delegation called upon all countries to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

17. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 110 votes to 2, with 46 abstentions.*

19. **Ms. Morgan** (Mexico) said that while the draft resolution addressed a very important issue for the international community, her delegation was disappointed by the lack of agreement and had therefore abstained. It was vital to ensure the participation of NGOs in the discussions. The inclusion of the phrase "non-objection basis" in paragraph 12 of the draft resolution was therefore regrettable, as it appeared to limit their participation without introducing the principle of due process.

20. Her delegation also regretted that Member States had failed to agree on her delegation's proposal for a negotiated outcome document. Certain States lacked the political will to reach a consensus on such an important topic. Despite the best efforts of the facilitator and the Chair, the negotiations had become very strained and the intransigence of certain groups, in particular the European Union, had been disappointing.

21. **Ms. Chartres** (Australia) said that her country was a proud multicultural society, an active participant in the Global Forum on Migration and Development and a staunch supporter of robust, transparent and meaningful engagement with civil society. Given their independence, commitment and diversity, civil society organizations played a legitimate, well-established and respected role in the promotion and protection of human rights. Opportunities should be provided for all relevant stakeholders to have their views heard at high-level dialogues and other deliberations of the United Nations. The principle that NGOs should be included and that their participation should be determined in a transparent manner was at the core of the values of the United Nations.

22. **Ms. Hay** (New Zealand) said that her country was also a country of immigrants with a multi-cultural and diverse population; however, there were many issues surrounding migration that warranted discussion. Her delegation had abstained because of its concerns over paragraph 12. It valued the contribution of NGOs to United Nations high-level discussions, and considered that the process set out in the resolution for the accreditation of NGOs not in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council did not reflect the core principles of due process and transparency. It regretted that, despite the precedents within the United Nations system for dealing with that issue, a consensus had not been reached.

23. **Mr. Mero** (United Republic of Tanzania) said that despite the best efforts of the facilitator and the Bureau to find a consensual solution, the opinions of Member States had been too polarized. He hoped that in future, Member States would make greater efforts to reach a consensus.

24. **Mr. Guerber** (Switzerland) said that, as the United Nations was the legitimate forum to promote coherence at all levels of policy related to migration and development, his delegation supported the development agenda beyond 2015 and the decision to organize a high-level dialogue. The facilitators had submitted a balanced text that reflected the concerns of all parties, and many of the paragraphs had been the result of negotiated compromise solutions. The lack of consensus was regrettable and served only to weaken the relevance of the draft resolution.

25. His delegation was also concerned that no consensus had been reached on the modalities for the participation in the high-level dialogue of NGOs that did not have consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. Despite the efforts of the facilitator and the Chair to reach a compromise, his delegation was not satisfied with the ambiguous language of paragraph 12. While Member States were entitled to express their views on the participation of NGOs, any objections should be made transparently and should be considered by the General Assembly. For all of those reasons, his delegation had abstained.

26. **Mr. Langeland** (Norway) said that it was regrettable that consensus had not been reached on the

draft resolution. While his delegation fully supported the decision to organize a high-level dialogue on international migration and development, it had abstained owing to concerns over the participation of civil society, which was an important part of the process.

27. **Mr. Djacta** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, thanked those Member States which had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which addressed an important issue for the Group of 77 and China.

The meeting was suspended at 7.50 p.m. and resumed at 8.10 p.m.

Agenda item 25: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.14 and L.64)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/67/L.14 and L.64: Quadrennial comprehensive policy review (*continued*)

28. **The Chair** invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution, the text of which had been circulated as an informal, unedited paper in English only, replacing the draft contained in the original document (A/C.2/67/L.14). The text would be issued subsequently as document A/C.2/67/L.64, submitted by Mr. Mero (United Republic of Tanzania), Vice-Chair of the Committee. Because negotiations on the text had concluded only a few hours earlier, he suggested that the Committee should take action on the informal paper on the understanding that the text would be issued in all official languages and made available to Member States when the Committee's reports were considered by the General Assembly.

29. *It was so decided.*

30. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications, said that the new and expanded mandates set out in paragraphs 131, 142, 160, 172, 181 and 187-189 of the draft resolution would require the strengthening of the Office for Economic and Social Council Support and Coordination, with general temporary assistance support at the P-4 and P-3 levels for 24 months and $200,000 in consultancy resources in 2014-2015 to assist with substantive preparations and analysis of the implementation of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review and liaison with key stakeholders. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, requirements of $1,297,100, to cover two general temporary assistance positions for 24 months, related operational costs, consultancy services and office accommodation, would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

31. **Mr. Wennubst** (Switzerland), speaking as the facilitator of the informal consultations, said that the draft resolution was robust, pragmatic, relevant and efficient and would create savings that would allow more resources to be diverted to field operations.

32. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.64 was adopted.*

33. **Mr. Mero** (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the complex negotiations had improved the text adopted at previous sessions, thereby promoting efficiency and providing tools for national development programmes.

34. **Ms. Eckey** (Norway) said that the quadrennial comprehensive policy review would make a difference in the field and benefit the United Nations system. All participants in the negotiations had striven to ensure concrete deliverables and the result would enable her country to continue to be a partner in United Nations development activities.

35. **Mr. Djacta** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, commended the transparency shown by developed countries in the negotiations.

36. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that while her delegation supported the goals of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review and believed that it would be a very useful tool, additional time was required to consider details contained in the oral statement of programme budget implications. Given that the estimates had not been adequately considered by Member States in any appropriate forum, their basis was questionable, particularly as the draft resolution did not give the Office for Economic and Social Council Support and Coordination any new or expanded mandate.

37. **Mr. Bargawi** (Observer for the European Union) said that the European Union attached great importance to the principles of aid effectiveness, as underlined at the four High-level Forums on Aid Effectiveness, which formed the basis of efforts to improve

accountability and strengthen the effectiveness and impact of development aid. The Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, held in Busan, had reviewed States' efforts to implement commitments on aid effectiveness and broaden the aid effectiveness agenda.

38. With regard to the oral statement of programme budget implications, his delegation shared the concerns expressed by the representative of the United States of America. The figures presented were only estimates motivated by an overly strict interpretation of rule 153 of the rules of procedure. They did not prejudge the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 to be submitted by the Secretary-General to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee and should not be perceived as having been endorsed by Member States.

39. **Mr. Momita** (Japan) said that it was regrettable that the details of the programme budget implications had not been made available to Member States earlier. Such information should be provided to delegations in the course of the consultations on draft resolutions. His delegation had questions and reservations concerning the statement of programme budget implications. The costs related to the draft resolution should be absorbed in the Secretariat's cost-saving efforts and should be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The statement of programme budget implications was in no way binding on Member States.

40. **Ms. Chartres** (Australia), speaking on behalf of Canada, Australia and New Zealand (CANZ), said that CANZ had not had time to review the content of the oral statement of programme budget implications and therefore reserved the right to review the estimates in the appropriate forums.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.14 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 116: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.65)

Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly

42. **The Chair** drew attention to the Committee's draft programme of work for the sixty-eighth session (A/C.2/67/L.65).

43. *The draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly submitted by the Chair was adopted.*

Working methods of the Second Committee

44. **The Chair** said that the Bureau had taken note of the various views expressed during the informal consultations on working methods of the Committee held on 4 October 2012 and had prepared a non-paper which would be transmitted to delegations in due course. The paper outlined ideas to be considered by the incoming Bureau on how to improve the Committee's working methods.

Agenda item 131: Programme planning (*continued*)

45. **The Chair** informed the Committee that he had been advised by the Secretariat that there were no matters requiring the Committee's attention or action under that agenda item. He took it that the Committee decided that no action was required of it under that agenda item.

46. *It was so decided.*

Completion of the Committee's work at the main part of the sixty-seventh session

47. **The Chair**, in his closing remarks, thanked all delegations, in particular the Vice-Chairs, the Rapporteur, the facilitators of the draft proposals and the members of the Secretariat, and also acknowledged the efforts of many staff members who had facilitated the Committee's work, which was fundamental to the advancement of the United Nations development agenda.

48. The Committee's deliberations had focused on the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), entitled "The future we want". Also at the forefront of its discussions had been the quadrennial comprehensive policy review, which was of great importance to the work of the United Nations system and the vast majority of Member States.

49. Global economic difficulties had meant that issues such as the pace of economic recovery, unemployment, commodity price volatility and sovereign debt crises had featured prominently. Nevertheless, delegations had been able to negotiate significant draft resolutions on international

macroeconomic and trade policy. Countries in special situations, including small island developing States, least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and post-conflict countries, had been hardest hit by global economic uncertainty and needed continuing support. In that connection, the Committee had taken significant steps to follow up on the commitments of the Istanbul Programme of Action.

50. The threats of food and nutrition insecurity, climate change, poverty and deprivation had also required attention. Moreover, the Committee had reaffirmed the importance of South-South cooperation and strengthened multilateralism in addressing development challenges. The Committee's work had coincided with a shift from a traditional view of economic development towards the concept of sustainable development in which economic, social and environmental issues should be addressed jointly and holistically. Its work would help to define development and shape the pursuit of international cooperation.

The meeting rose at 8.50 p.m.